

Date: Mon, 18 Jan 93 04:30:31 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #16
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 18 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 16

Today's Topics:

(none)

Further evidence that CW should no be longer relevant was (Re: USCG cw changes)
Oregon VE's

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 17 Jan 93 22:51:49 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: (none)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Quent Johnson (quent@md.fsl.noaa.gov) said:

What if someone sends email containing obscenities.
What about sound files containing music?
What about email to mailing lists -- is this considered broadcasting?

I say:

I'm sure the control op eithe inspects the mail (unlikely) or has a
kill file that looks for "obsscene, indecent, or profane words" in the
text and doesn't allow transmission if it finds one. The full part of
97.113(d) goes futher than this though: obsscene, indecent, or profane
words or meaning [it might be difficult to stop the later with a kill
file is only 'clean' words are used]; and/or false or deceptive
messages or signals [this too are more difficult to detect]". Once must

also be wary of commercial messages (i.e look for the string "900" :-). The FCC did backoff on the responsibilities of sysops who relayed messages in the system, the originator having the full responsibility. Unfortunately the control operator of the gateway is the responsible person in this case. This may explain why there are very few gateways.

Data files containing musical sounds are only musical sounds when played on the appropriate equipment. They don't sound like music on the air (just sound like packets too me) so they're not in violation of Part 97.113(d). Consider why this rule was put in place originally and you can see it can't apply to data files. This might actually become important with more people getting into multimedia.

All the transmissions are point to point on the ham side, so there is no broadcasting involved. Note that bulletins (messages with multiple destinations) are allowed in the packet system and are not considered "broadcasts" because all transmissions involved are two way QSOs (between the BBSes passing the messages and the intermediate nodes).

In general, don't under interpret the FCC regulations and don't ask the FCC what the rules mean, as they'll often come up with a more conservative ruling further restricting experimentation in the amateur service.

Follow ups are best directed to rec.radio.ham.policy

72/73 Kevin, N7WIM / G8UDP
a-kevinp@microsoft.com

Date: Sat, 16 Jan 93 12:12:47 CST
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.oc.com!utacfd.uta.edu!rwsys!ricksys!
news@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Further evidence that CW should no be longer relevant was (Re: USCG cw
changes)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

[The original message was posted to r.r.shortwave,r.r.a.misc.
If anyone want to discuss CW's relevance in modern communications,
particularly with regard to Amateur Radio then followup-to r.r.a.policy]

lee@tosspot.sv.com (Lee Reynolds) writes:

>Just an FYI for those of us that like to monitor such things....
>
>
> U.S. COAST GUARD TO DISCONTINUE WATCHKEEPING ON THE DISTRESS
> FREQUENCY 500 KHZ AND CEASE ALL MORSE CODE SERVICES

>
> Effective August 1, 1993, all United States Coast Guard
> Communication Stations and Cutters will discontinue watchkeeping on
> the distress frequency 500 KHZ, and will cease all morse code
> services in the medium frequency radiotelegraphy band. More
> efficient telecommunication systems are now available to provide
> the mariner with options for initiating or relaying distress
> alerts, and passing and receiving maritime safety information.

Is not the fact that the USCG is discontinuing use of Morse Code,
further indication that it is an antiquated mode that no one should be
required to learn it, at least 5 wpm should be enough?

As I practice CW I find it's not so hard but, unless I fall in love
with it I probably won't ever use it. If it takes me 30 minutes a day,
at least 5 days a week, for 4 weeks or more to get from 5 wpm to 13
could not this time be used for something better (not that wouldn't
waste the time)?

I'll listen to and (or) read any argument except, "You have to do it
because I had to," or "What if your in a plane that crashes and the
mike is broke and you can only communicate by touching two wires
together."

IF the USCG can see that cw is no longer an effiecient means of
communicating, how long will it be required for Amateurs that want to
communicate on HF?

--

Internet: rick@ricksys.lonestar.org

If I bounce (the maps have errors that I have no control over) then use
bo836@cleveland.freenet.edu

BITNET: bo836%cleveland.freenet.edu@cunyvm

Date: Fri, 15 Jan 1993 22:53:00
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.oc.com!utacfd.uta.edu!rwsys!ocitor!
FredGate@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Oregon VE's
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hello everyone,

I'm looking for some ARRL VE's in Oregon. I know some people on other echos
that are in Oregon and are trying to find some VE sessions close to them.
Can anyone post me a list of VE sessions. I need the cities and a person
to contact for the times and places.

Tnx and 73's AA7KV Anthony (Carrollton, TX) W5YI VE# 10496

* Origin: Com Port 1 - DFW Amateur Radio BBS (214) 226-1181 (1:124/7009)

* Origin: Com Port 1 - DFW Amateur Radio BBS (214) 226-1181 (1:124/7009)

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #16
